

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_114927
Title of the Manuscript:	DESIGN AND TECHNO-ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF AN IMPROVED MULTIPURPOSE COOKER STOVE.
Type of the Article	Original Research

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>As per the objectives of the study, the work done is important for scientific community.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Good but could be shortened</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The conclusion and recommendation section lack references. There is no or very little amount of comparison between the previous and recent or current study.</p> <p>The manuscript appears more like a chapter of a dissertation and does not have a proper methodology section. The result section has objectives which could be mentioned in the Introduction section. The Literature review section must be shortened or can be merged with either Introduction and Conclusion/Discussion section</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Though the objectives are addressed in the result section. It lacks references from previous work thus not justifying where lies the novelty of the study.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Moitreyee Banerjee Chakrabarty
Department, University & Country	Durgapur Government College, India